Applicant: Gianfranco D'Amato Attorney's Docket No.: 27514-0005US1

Serial No.: 10/583,181 Filed: April 23, 2007

Page : 6 of 8

REMARKS

Claim 1 and 22 have been amended to recite subject matter similar to the subject matter of claim 8, which has been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-7, 9-11 and 22-31 are pending.

Claims 1-7 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,153,911 (Benedetti) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,482,765 (Probst).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that inner edges of the peripheral recesses on the blank extend at least in part along an overlap line. An example of this feature is shown in FIG. 1 of the present application, which shows a blank 1 with peripheral recesses 10 whose inner edges 21 extend at least in part along an overlap line 20 (*i.e.*, the line to which the opposing edge extends in overlap).

In contrast, the inside edge of the recess 10 of Benedetti is not disposed in the overlap region at all; thus, no part of the inside edge of the recess 10 extends along the opposing edge 8 when overlapped. *See* Benedetti, FIGS. 1 and 2.

In FIG. 1 of Probst, the inside edges of recesses 14 and 20 are likewise outside of the overlapping region. The inside edges of all the other recesses of Probst (e.g., recesses 16, 18 of FIG. 1 and all of the recesses 14, 16, 18, 20 of FIG. 3) do not extend to or along an overlap line. See Probst, FIGS. 1 and 3. This is best illustrated by the opposite edge of flap 8 extending significantly past the inside edge of recess 14 when recesses 14 and 16 are overlapped. See Probst, FIG. 4.

Claim 1 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-7 and 9-11 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 22, 25-28, 30 and 31 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,153,911 (Benedetti) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,482,765 (Probst).

Applicant: Gianfranco D'Amato Attorney's Docket No.: 27514-0005US1

Serial No.: 10/583,181 Filed: April 23, 2007

Page : 7 of 8

Claim 22 has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1. More particularly, claim 22 has been amended to recite that inner edges of the peripheral recesses in a blank extend at least in part along an overlap line. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Benedetti and Probst do not disclose or render obvious the claimed subject matter.

Claim 22 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 25-28, 30 and 31 depend from claim 22 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22.

Claims 23, 24 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Benedetti and Probst in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,031,826 to (Seufert) or U.S. Patent No. 6,378,763 (Nelson).

Claims 23, 24 and 29 depend from claim 22. As discussed above, claim 22, as amended, recites that inner edges of peripheral recesses in a blank extend at least in part along an overlap line. Since Seufert and Nelson do not disclose peripheral recesses at all, they do not disclose or render obvious the claimed subject matter.

Claims 23, 24 and 29 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant: Gianfranco D'Amato Attorney's Docket No.: 27514-0005US1

Serial No.: 10/583,181 Filed: April 23, 2007

Page : 8 of 8

Applicant requests that the Office update its files to reflect new Attorney Docket No.: 27514-0005US1.

A Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time is enclosed. The petition fee in the amount of \$130 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by deposit account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. <u>06-1050</u>, referencing Docket No. <u>27514-0005US1</u>.

Respectfully submitted,

> S. Peter Ludwig Reg. No. 25,351

Customer Number 26,211 Fish & Richardson P.C. 601 Lexington Avenue 52nd Floor New York, NY 10022 Telephone: (212) 765-5070

Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

30538167.doc